

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 28-33, 35-38, and 40 under 35 USC 102, and claim 39 under 35 USC 103. Claim 34 has been allowed.

Claims 35 and 36 have been amended to correct minor informalities. Thus, claims 1-5 and 28-43 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Claim Objections

It is believed that the objections have been overcome by the amendments made above.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-5, 28-33, 35-38, and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Gan et al (6,775,144)*.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 1 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a quick release handle that is pivotally coupled to the housing..." In *Gan*, the handle 66 is attached to the hood 10 not the chassis 30. See for example Col. 3 lines 16-19 and Figs. 1 and 2. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 35 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a quick release handle configured to facilitate the engagement and disengagement of the locking mechanisms via a pivoting action." In *Gan*, the handle 66 is not used for assembly. The handle 66 is only used for disassembly. See for example Col. 3 lines 1-45. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 40 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a handle that is pivotally coupled to the housing..." In *Gan*, the handle 66 is attached to the hood 10 not the chassis 30. See for example Col. 3 lines 16-19 and Figs. 1 and 2. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Although the rejections to the dependent claims 2-5, 28-34, 36-39 and 41-43 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above, it should be noted that they provide additional language that is unsupported by the cited art. For example:

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 3 specifically requires, "the locking mechanisms engaging and disengaging one another via the rotation of the quick release handle." Again, in *Gan*, the handle 66 is not used to engage. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 4 specifically requires, "...a plurality of retention hooks located on the housing..." In *Gan*, the chassis side includes slits 624 and 422 and not hooks. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 5 specifically requires, "...wherein the retention hooks are movable between an engagement position...and a disengagement position..." *Gan* simply does not teach or suggest hooks that are movable. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 36 specifically requires, "...housing side locking mechanism includes a plurality of flanges..." In *Gan*, the chassis side includes slits 624 and 422 and not flanges. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Gan*, claim 38 specifically requires, "...a stiffener that is attached to an inner surface of the access door..." and further "the stiffener being configured for insertion into a recess within the access opening when the access door covers the access opening." While *Gan* may show edging as suggested by the Examiner, *Gan* simply does not teach or suggest an additional structural element that is attached to the door. See for example Figs. 5A and 5B of the present invention. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claim 39 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gan* in view of *Worley et al* (6,359,214) and further in view of *Radu et al* (6,542,384).

Worley and *Radu* do not overcome the deficiencies of *Gan*. That is, none references teaches or suggest "...a quick release handle configured to facilitate the engagement and disengagement of the locking mechanisms via a pivoting action..." as disclosed in claim 35 from which claim 39 depends. In addition, none of the references teach or suggest, "wherein an EMI gasket is positioned around the outer perimeter of the stiffener..." as disclosed in claim 39. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 34 has been allowed if rewritten to overcome the objection.

SUMMARY

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Quin C. Hoellwarth
Reg. No. 45,738

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300